1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Jay Edelson (Admitted pro hac vice) jedelson@edelson.com Rafey S. Balabanian (Admitted pro hac vice) rbalabanian@edelson.com Benjamin H. Richman (Admitted pro hac vice) brichman@edelson.com Christopher L. Dore (Admitted pro hac vice) cdore@edelson.com J. Dominick Larry (Admitted pro hac vice) nlarry@edelson.com EDELSON PC 350 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1300 Chicago, Illinois 60654 Tel: 312.589.6370 Fax: 312.589.6378 (additional counsel on signature block) Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Putative Classe	
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15 16		

Plaintiffs Jeffrey Molnar, Wesley Thornton, Aileen Martinez, Chiquita Bell, Teyia Bolden, and Antoinette Stansberry (collectively "Plaintiffs"), and Defendant NCO Financial Systems, Inc. ("NCO," and collectively with Plaintiffs, "the Parties") hereby agree to and request the Court's approval of an extension of 90 days to the following scheduled dates set forth in the Court's Scheduling Orders of April 10, 2014 (Dkt. 81) and September 10, 2014 (Dkt. 103).

- 1. On April 10, 2014, the Court issued a Scheduling order, setting forth September 23, 2014 as the deadline for Plaintiffs to file their motion for class certification. (Dkt. 81.)
- 2. On September 10, 2014, on the Parties' joint motion, the Court extended Plaintiffs' class certification deadline to November 22, 2014. (Dkt. 103.) That same week, the Parties met and conferred regarding NCO's responses to Plaintiffs' fourth requests for the production of documents, as well as their interrogatories, and discussed a procedure whereby NCO, in lieu of responding to several of Plaintiffs' discovery requests as posed, could instead provide a representative sampling of account files. (See Declaration of J. Dominick Larry ("Larry Dec."), attached hereto, at ¶ 7.)
- 3. After further discussion between the Parties, and on the Court's request, the Parties jointly moved for an extension of the deadlines for each to submit a joint statement for determination of discovery disputes. (Dkt. 106.) In that motion, the Parties stated that they expected to reach a consensus on whether a sampling would take place (and if so on what terms) no later than October 3, 2014. (*Id.* 3.)
- 4. Over the course of the following month, NCO (along with its counsel) worked to both put mechanisms in place to effectuate the sampling, and to prepare a preliminary sample (in effect, a sampling of the sample) to provide to Plaintiffs' counsel, so that the Parties could meaningfully discuss the final form of the sample production. (Id. ¶¶ 8 10.) Throughout this time, Plaintiffs' counsel repeatedly sought updates and further information from NCO's counsel regarding the status of the sample, and generally impressed upon NCO the urgency of the production. (Id.)

- 5. On November 7, 2014, NCO produced the preliminary sample to its attorneys for review. Upon reviewing the sample, Defendant's counsel determined that the sample lacked certain information responsive to Plaintiffs' requests, and that NCO would have to modify and restart the sampling procedure. (*Id.* ¶ 11.)
- 6. On November 10, 2014 Plaintiffs' counsel conferred with NCO's counsel by both telephone and email regarding the sampling and the instant motion. (Id. ¶ 12.) NCO's counsel informed Plaintiffs' counsel of the deficiencies in the preliminary sample, and of NCO's ongoing attempt to produce a satisfactory sample. After further discussion, NCO's counsel informed Plaintiffs' counsel that it could not provide a definitive timeline for completing the production, but that its best estimate was between 30 and 45 days. (Id. ¶¶ 12 17.) NCO's counsel also reiterated that it had no opposition to Plaintiffs' proposed extension. (Id.)
- 7. To expedite the process of reviewing the sample, the Parties have agreed that NCO will provide a rolling production, such that Plaintiffs' counsel can begin reviewing the sampling while NCO is still assembling it. Nonetheless, full production, reviewing the entire sample, drawing conclusions from it, providing it to the Parties' respective experts, and using the information gleaned from it to brief class certification will take substantial time. (*Id.* ¶ 17.) As such, Plaintiffs request, and NCO does not oppose, that Plaintiffs' deadline to file their motion for class certification be extended to February 20, 2015 (i.e., 60 days from the anticipated completion of the sampling, and 90 days from the current November 22, 2014 deadline), in order to allow the Parties adequate time to produce, review, and utilize the sample, and to account for any potential sampling delays associated with the upcoming holiday season. (*Id.* ¶ 18.)
- 8. Furthermore, in order for the Parties to fully incorporate both the full sampling and any class certification order into their merits discovery efforts (including depositions and further discovery requests), and to account for any potential sampling delays associated with the upcoming holiday season, Plaintiffs request—and NCO has not indicated opposition to—an extension of 45 days for all remaining dates in the

Court's scheduling order. (Id. ¶ 19.) Specifically, Plaintiffs request that the Court extend the Parties' deadline to:

- a. disclose the identities of their experts regarding the merits from January 5, 2015 to February 19, 2015;
- b. disclose the identities of their rebuttal experts regarding the merits from January 26, 2015 to March 12, 2015;
- c. disclose their Rule 26(a)(2)(B) expert reports from February 9, 2015 to March 26, 2015;
- d. supplement their merits-related disclosures regarding contradictory or rebuttal evidence from February 23, 2015 to April 9, 2015;
- e. complete *all* discovery, including experts, from March 23, 2015 to May 7, 2015;
- f. file all other pretrial motions, including motions for summary judgment, from March 13, 2015 to April 27, 2015;
- g. file their memoranda of contentions of fact and law from May 27, 2015 to July 13, 2015;
- h. comply with the pre-trial disclosure requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(3) from May 27, 2015 to July 13, 2015;
- i. meet and take the action required by Local Rule 16.1(f)(4) from June 3, 2015 to July 20, 2015.
- 9. The relief requested herein is sought in good faith and not for any improper purpose, such as delay. (*Id.* \P 21.)

WHEREFORE, for the reasons stated above, Plaintiffs and Defendant jointly request that this honorable Court enter an order extending Plaintiffs' deadline to file their motion for class certification through February 20, 2015, extend all remaining deadlines by 45 days, and award any such other relief as the Court deems reasonable and just.

Respectfully Submitted, 1 JEFFREY MOLNAR, WESLEY 2 THORNTON, AILEEN MARTINEZ, 3 CHIQUITA BELL, TEYIA BOLDEN, and **ANTOINETTE STANSBERRY** individually 4 and on behalf of all others similarly situated, 5 Dated: November 12, 2014 By: s/ J. Dominick Larry 6 Counsel for Plaintiffs 7 Jay Edelson (Admitted *pro hac vice*) 8 jedelson@edelson.com Rafey S. Balabanian (Admitted *pro hac vice*) 9 rbalabanian@edelson.com Benjamin H. Richman (Admitted *pro hac vice*) 10 brichman@edelson.com 11 Christopher L. Dore (Admitted *pro hac vice*) cdore@edelson.com 12 J. Dominick Larry (Admitted pro hac vice) 13 nlarry@edelson.com EDELSON PC 14 350 North LaSalle Street, Suite 1300 Chicago, Illinois 60654 15 Tel: 312.589.6370 16 Fax: 312.589.6378 17 Ronald A. Marron 18 ron@consumersadvocates.com Alexis M. Wood 19 alexis@consumersadvocates.com Kas Gallucci 20 kas@consumersadvocates.com 21 LAW OFFICES OF RONALD A. MARRON 651 Arroyo Drive 22 San Diego, California 92103 Tel: 619.696.9006 23 Fax: 619.564.6665 24 Douglas J. Campion 25 doug@djcampion.com LAW OFFICES OF DOUGLAS J. CAMPION, APC 26 409 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 303 27 San Diego, California 92108 Tel: 619.299.2091 28 Fax: 619.858.0034

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I HEREBY CERTIFY that on November 12, 2014, I served the above and foregoing by causing a true and accurate copy of such paper to be filed and served on all counsel of record via the Court's CM/ECF electronic filing system. s/ J. Dominick Larry